

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
COURT OF APPEALS

---

In the Matter of  
CHANEL TALISE WEBSTER-BENNETT,  
ALYCE MONE'T WEBSTER-BENNETT, and  
MATTHEW JOSIAH BENNETT, Minors.

---

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES, f/k/a  
FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

UNPUBLISHED  
April 20, 2006

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

TIARA JONAE ROBINSON, a/k/a TIARA  
JONAE BENNETT,

No. 265098  
Wayne Circuit Court  
Family Division  
LC No. 98-373567-NA

Respondent-Appellant,

and

FREDERICK WEBSTER,

Respondent.

---

Before: Murphy, P.J., and O'Connell and Murray, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant appeals as of right from the trial court order terminating her parental rights to the minor children under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g), and (j). We affirm. This appeal is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

The trial court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 3.977(J); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). The principal condition that led to adjudication was respondent-appellant's failure to protect her children from the physical abuse that respondent-appellant's boyfriend, Fenton Robinson, inflicted on the children. Although respondent-appellant was ordered to have no contact with Robinson, evidence was presented at trial that she continued her relationship with him, marrying him more than a year after the trial court assumed jurisdiction, and having a child with him more than two years after the court assumed jurisdiction. The

evidence also supported the conclusion that, because respondent-appellant could not end her relationship with Robinson, she was unable to provide proper care and custody for them. Further, because there was evidence that Robinson is still in respondent-appellant's life, the evidence supports the conclusion that the children would likely be harmed if returned to respondent-appellant. Additionally, there was evidence that respondent-appellant failed to treat her mental health condition and failed to obtain safe and suitable housing.

Further, the evidence did not show that termination of respondent-appellant's parental rights was clearly not in the children's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo Minors*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). Although there was testimony that respondent-appellant is bonded with the children and loves them, there was also evidence that respondent-appellant could not provide a safe environment for the children because of her relationship with Robinson. Thus, the trial court did not err in terminating respondent-appellant's parental rights to the children.

Affirmed.

/s/ William B. Murphy  
/s/ Peter D. O'Connell  
/s/ Christopher M. Murray